# C A S E

OF

### Mr. DA COSTA

WITH

## Mr. MONMARTEL,

RELATING TO

# A Bill of Exchange.



LONDON:
Printed in the YEAR M.DCC.XXXVI,





\*NOGNOG

distant in the Year M.D.Commiy J.



#### THE

# CASE of Mr. Da Costa with Mr. Monmartel, &c.

HE following remarkable Case, where Mr. Anthony Da Costa was condemn'd by Arbitration, may serve as an Instance to inform Merchants, that they may involve themselves in Losses, notwithstanding they act with Justice, Equity, and Zeal, for the Interest of their Correspondents.

Mr. Da Costa's Arbitrator was John Bristow, Esq; to whom he gave the following Instructions.

M. Le Maire, Secretary to Mr. De Chavigny, desired to know of Mr. Da Costa, if he had an Order to pay him 400 Pounds; and if not, whether he would pay them by his Letter of Attorney to Mess. Louis Guillemau and Company in his Absence, he being then order'd to go to France. At that Time Mr. Da Costa had none; but after Mr. Le Maire was gone, he received the same, and, according to the Direction of Mr. Le Maire, he paid the Money to Mess. Louis Guillemau and Company, on the 21st of Octob. by virtue of the Letter of Attorney he had of Mr. Le Maire:

which plainly shews the great Confidence and Credit reposed in Mess. Guilleman and Company.

Mr. Anthony Da Costa drew a Bill for Paris on Thursday the 23d of October, 1735. for Liv. 9389. 14. 8. payable to the Order of Mess. Louis Guillemau and Company, at  $30\frac{7}{8}$  per Crown, which is  $\frac{1}{8}$  more than the current Price of the Exchange that Day for Paris, makes 402l. 13 s. Sterling.

On Monday the 27th of October in the Afternoon, Mr. Louis Guillemau died, and immediately they feal'd up the Compting-house; for which Reason, from the Instant of his Death, no further Payments were made, which happen'd before the fecond Bill was paid. And as the first Bill was at one Day's Date, and immediately indorfed unto D. Pedro Nolasco Couvay of Paris, the same was received there before the News came of the Death of the faid Guillemau; fince which Mr. John Green, the fole acting Executor, has taken out the Administration of Mr. Guilleman's Will, and refuses to pay the Value of the Bill, altho' the faid Money was paid at Paris to Mr. Couvay, and credited to the Account of the deceased Mr. Guillemau, who at the Time Mr. Da Costa gave his Bill was in full Credit, as is publick and notorious.

The Gentleman for whose Account Mr. Da Costa drew the Bill pretends, that he has nothing to do with Mr. Guillemau, that he has paid the Bill he drew on him, and that if Mr. Da Costa did not receive the Money, the same is at his Peril; for that at the Time he gave the Bill he ought to have received Satisfaction for the same, notwithstanding no Commission was allow'd for standing al Credere, nor any Account was depending betwixt Mr. Guillemau and Mr. Da Costa, nor any Advan-

Advantage what seever could accrue from it to the latter. And the this Case is so very plain, and the Law is intirely of Mr. Da Costa's Side, both here, and in all other Trading Parts, to avoid Law Charges, and to shew the Justice of his Cause, the said Mr. Da Costa left the same to be decided by Arbitration, and chose John Bristow, Esq; for his Arbitrator, promising to abide by what should so be determin'd.

Copy of Mr. VAN NECK's Instructions to his Arbitrator John Gore, Esq;

THE 26th of October, N. S. Mr. Paris de Monmartel, of Paris, order'd Mr. Anthony Da Costa, of London, to pay for Account of said Monmartel to Mr. Le Maire 400 l. Sterling, and to reimburse himself, with the Charges, upon him of said Sum.

Mr. Da Costa paid said Sum the 21st of October, O. S. and here appears the Letter which Mr. Da Costa wrote to said Monmartel the 23d of said Month.

BT virtue of the Letter of Attorney of Mr. Le Maire, I paid to Mess. Louis Guilleman and Company for your Account 400 l. Sterling; and on the Back of the Letter of Attorney, which Mr. Le Maire left him, you'll find the Receipt. And for my Reimbursement I draw on you this Day, Livres 9389. 14. 8. Tournois, as noted at Foot.

Livres 9389. 14. 8. I draw on you this Day, to the Order of Mess. Louis Guilleman and Company, at one Day's Date, which, at 30 \frac{7}{8} per Crown, amounts to 402 \lambda 13 s. Sterling, which I have cre-

dited you; and per Contra debited of said Sum, viz.

Paid to Meff. Los	ais C	Guil	lem	au	an	d,	1.	s.
Paid to Mess. Low Company, by vir Attorney of Mr.	tue d	of the	be l	Lett	er e	of \	100	0
Commission at $\frac{1}{2}$ per								
Brokeridge,							0	8
Postage of Letters,								5
						1.4	.02	13

The 14th of the following Month of November, N. S. the Bill which Mr. Da Costa had drawn on Mr. Paris de Monmartel being due, said Bill was paid to Mr. Couvay, he being the Bearer thereof.

The next Day, 15th of November, Mr. Monmartel received two Letters from Mr. Anthony Da Costa, one dated the 29th of October, and the other dated the 30th of said Month, O. S.

By the first, dated the 29th of October, Mr. Da Costa says, "That Mr. Louis Guillemau, to whom he gave his first Bill of Exchange for his Reimbursement of said 400 l. Sterling, was dead, and that he, Da Costa, had not received the Value for the second Bill."

By the Letter dated the 30th of October, Mr. Da Costa sends the Protest, done the same Day, with the second Bill of Exchange, to prove "that he had not received the Value of it, and advances, "that his Bill not being paid, the Risque is for Mr. Monmartel's Account: Giving for his Reasons, "that the Custom in London is, that when a Bill is drawn upon the Exchange, the Pay-

"Payment thereof is not made till the next

Mr. Da Costa brings an Attestation, signed by a great many creditable Merchants, confirming said Custom, by virtue of which Mr. Da Costa desires to be free of all Risques.

Mr. Monmartel advances the contrary, and that it is precifely faid Custom, which condemns Mr. Da Cofta; because " that having given his " Bill on the Thursday 23d of October, he ought, according to Custom, to have fent for the Payment the next Post after the second Bill, \* that is to fay, the Monday 27th of October, which " Day Mr. Guillemau's Clerks did pay more than " 2000 1. for Bills of Exchange by him accepted and due that Day, or for Bills of Exchange for " Italy, which he had taken the Thursday before, " of many Merchants. So that all that faid Guilleman had to pay said Monday 27th of October. was punctually paid +; and Mr. Da Cofta should have been paid, if he had conform'd himself to " faid Custom; but having given his Bill at " Credit to receive the Money the Thursday following, 30th of October, that is to fay, one " Post more than what is customary upon the " Exchange of London; therefore Mr. Da Costa " is precifely condemn'd.

<sup>\*</sup> Which he did, as appears by Mr. Julian's Oath.

<sup>+</sup> The contrary is evident from Mr. Lossau's Declaration before Mr. Delpeche, Not. Pub.

Copie des Raisons de Mons. VAN NECK a Mr. JOHN GORE, Esq; son Arbitrateur.

L E 26. Octobre, 1735. N. S. Mr. Paris de Monmartel de Paris ordonne a Mr. Anthoine Da Costa de Londres de payer pour son compte a Mons. Le Maire 1. 400 Esterlins, & de se renbourser sur luy de cette somme par a point avec le frais: Mr. Da Costa execute le payement le 21. Octobre, V. S. & voici l'extrait de la letre qu'il escrit le 23. du même mois a Mons. de Monmartel.

J'AT payé a Mess. Louis Guillemau & Compagnie par procuration de Mons. Le Maire 400 l. Esterlins pour vôtre compte, & vous trouveres le receu au dos de la procuration que Mons. Le Maire luy avoit laisse, & pour mon remboursement je vous tire aujourd'bui l. 9389. 14. 8. Tournois, comme par la note au pied. Ensuite est escrit.

L. 9389. 14. 8. Tournois que je vous ai tiré a l'ordre de Mess. Louis Guillemau & Compagnie a 1. jour de datte, qui a 30 \frac{7}{8} font 402 l. 13 s. que je vous ay credittés, & par contre debitté la même somme, scavoir,

Payé a Mess. Louis Guillemau & Com-										0	
Commission a	1 P	er	C.							2	0
Courtage,										0	8
Port de Letre.	5,									0	5
									1	102	12

Le 14 du mois de Novembre suivant N. S. jour de l'echeance de la traite de Mr. Da Costa sur Mons. Monmartel elle sut payée a Mr. Couvay de Paris, qui en est porteur.

Le 15. du mois de Novembre Mons. de Monmartel receut deux lettres de Mons. Da Costa, l'une du 29. Octobre, & l'autre du 30. du même mois V. S.

Par la lettre du 29. Octobre Mons. Da Costa marque, que Mons. Louis Guillemau a qui il avoit fourny la lettre premiere de changé pour renboursement des 400 l. Esterlins, étoit mort, & que luy Da Costa n'avoit point receu la valeur de la seconde.

Par la lettre du 30. Octobre Mons Da Costa envoit un protest, sait le même jour, avec la seconde lettre de change, pour prouver qu'il n'en avoit point receu la valeur, & il pretend que le desaut de payement de sa traite est au risque de Mons. Monmartel, allegant pour se raisons, que l'usage a Londres est que quand on negocie une lettre sur la place, l'on donne un credit d'une poste a l'autre. Mr. Da Costa raporte une attestation signée de plusieurs fameux negotians, qui affirme cet usage, a la fauveur de laquelle Mr. Da Costa pretend être a couvert de tout risque.

Mons. Monmartel soutient au contraire, que c'est precisement cet usage, qui condamne Mr. Da Costa, parce que ayant sourni sa traite a Mess. Louis Guilleman & Compagnie le feudy 23. Octobre, il devoit suivant l'usage, envoyer recevoir le payement sur la seconde, la poste suivante, c'est a dire, le Lundy 27. Octobre, au quel jour les gens de Mons. Guilleman payerent plus de 2000 l. soit pour lettres de change par luy acceptees & echues ce jour

0

la, soit pour des lettres de change sur Italie, qui'l avoit prises le feudy precedent de divers negotians; en sorte que tout ce que Guillemau avoit a payer le dit Lundy 27. Octobre sur pontuelement payé, & Mons. Da Costa auroit été egalement paye s'il se étoit exactement conformé a l'usage au lieu, que ayant donné sa lettre a credit & aux conditions de n'en recevoir le payement que le feudy 30. Octobre, c'est a dire, une poste plus qu'il n'est l'usage de la place de Londres, sait precisement sa condemnation.

On the 19th of April, 1736. Mr. Da Costa was appointed to meet Mess. Gore, Bristow, and Gaultier, at Garraway's Coffee-bouse at Four o' Clock, which he did, as likewise Mr. Van Neck, who deliver'd the above Paper to the Arbitrators, and told them, that Paper contain'd all that he had to fay. Answer to which Paper Mr. Da Costa produced an Affidavit, sworn by Moses Henriquez Julian jun. before Sir Edward Bellamy, that on the 27th of October he demanded at the House of Mr. Guillemau Payment for Mr. Da Costa's second Bill, which amounted to 402 l. 13 s. Sterling; to which he was answer'd, that as Mr. Guillemau was just dead, which was about Three o' Clock in the Afternoon, no further Receipts or Payments could be made that Day. Besides this, Mr. Da Costa prevail'd upon Mr. Delpech, Notary Publick, to shew to the Arbitrators, that Sir Theodore Jansen, (who is a Gentleman of that Honour and Integrity, as not to declare before a Notary Publick any thing, but what is really fo, especially if the same should be to defraud the rest of the Creditors of Mess. Louis Guillemau and Company, ) had given them several Bills for Italy, which were to be paid on Monday the 27th of October, which was the Day on which Mr. Guillemau died, and demanded Payment

e

k

e

e

e

e,

a

1-

IS

,

h

e

1,

n

n

1.

f

u

h

e

١,

1,

e

d

e

a

t

It

d

T.

n

n

y

7-

nt

ment for faid Bills that Day; and was answer'd by Mr. Lostau, that nothing could be paid; for that as foon as Mr. Guillemau died, the Comptinghouse had been seal'd up. From whence it plainly appears, that no Payment whatfoever was made from the Death of Mr. Guillemau; and that tho' Mr. Da Costa had given his Bill upon Condition to be satisfied the Monday or Thursday following, yet faid Bill was demanded on the Monday, as teveral others, to which Answers were given, that no Payment could be made from the Death of Mr. Guillemau. Wherefore in this strict Sense, as Mr. Da Costa did demand his Money that Day, as appears by the Oath of Mr. Julian jun. and was not paid, which happen'd likewife to feveral others, it is plain that Mr. Paris de Monmartel, (to whom, he believes, the Bill doth not belong, but to another Great Man, who is indebted above 1600 l. to Mr. Guillemau and Company's Estate, ) might easily have cover'd himself of this Bill; and as all the Day is allow'd, and in the Afternoon they did not pay in strictest Rigour, and Mr. Da Costa demanded his Money in Compliance with the Time, and sent away the Protest the Thursday following, nothing was wanting on Mr. Da Cofta's Side. And as to the Allegations on the other Part, concerning the Limitation of eight Days, which Mr. Guillemau might have, if he defired, for the Payment of the Bill, it feems to be something extraordinary; for if the Case was as they represent, the Trust given was only three Days; for till Monday is what is due to the Remitter. Besides, it appears by the Letter of Mr. Monmartel, as likewise by that of Mr. Da Costa, sent to Mr. Bristow, that the Decision of the Arbitration ought to have been upon the Point, "Whether a Man who draws a Bill in London ought to receive his Money at the same 66 time 5

time; and if not, be liable to all Accidents which may happen, for not receiving the fame?"

Copy of Mr. Moses Henriquez Julian junior's Deposition.

I Moses Henriquez Julian jun. do declare upon Oath, That on 23. October, 1735. I adjusted with Mr. Anthony Da Costa, to give his Bill for 402 l. 13 s. for Paris, at one Day's Date, at 30 7 per Crown, to the Order of Mess. Louis Guilleman and Company, with whom I agreed to pay the fecond Bill the Monday following, and if not, the Thursday the 30. October. The faid Mr. Guilleman died the Monday 27. ditto, on which Day I went to his House, and spoke with his Clerks of his Compting-house about some Bills I took for Spain of faid Gentleman, and was answer'd, that they hoped they would be punctually paid. Afterwards I ask'd them the Payment of the second Bill for 402 l. 13 s. to which they answer'd, that Mr. Guillemau was just dead, and that every thing remain'd in Suspence till further Time, but that every thing would be duly satisfied. London, the 19th of April, 1736.

Sign'd by

Moses Henriquez Julian jun.

Sworn before me this Day, 19. April, 1736.

Sign'd Ed. Bellamy.

6

66

"

66

22

cc

"

66

nts

N

noo

ted

for

 $o^{\frac{7}{8}}$ 

nau the

the nau

ent

his

ain ney

er-

Bill

Mr. ing

hat

the

NB. 1. Mr. Delpech drew up the Bonds of Arbitration, without shewing them first to Mr. Da Costa, till they were engross'd, and ready to be sign'd, which Mr. Da Costa did, thinking his Case so plain as not to admit of any Controversy.

2. The two first Arbitrators not agreeing, chose Samuel Holden, Esq; for their Umpire, but afterwards set him aside, and chose James Gaultier, Esq; for what Reason Mr. Da Costa knows not.

The following is the Award given by the faid Gentleman: After reciting the Matters as above, it runs thus;

" Now know ye, That I the faid Fames Gaultier, Umpire, named and chosen as aforesaid, " having duly weigh'd and confider'd the abovemention'd feveral Allegations of the faid Parties in Difference, and having also heard and under-" ftood, and duly and maturely weigh'd and con-" fider'd the other feveral and respective Sayings, Allegations, and Proofs of the faid Parties in Difference, touching the faid first and second " Bill of Exchange; and it appearing unto me, " that the faid Anthony Da Costa had given unto " the faid Lewis Guilleman and Company eight Days Credit for the Payment of the Value of the faid fecond Bill of Exchange; whereas it is " and has been the constant Practice of Merchants " in this City to demand and receive Payment of " the Money on second Bills of Exchange for Paris, the next following Post-day after the

"Delivery of the first of such Bills of Exchange: "Therefore I the faid James Gaultier, taking " upon me the Charge of the faid Umpirage and Award, and being minded, as much as in me lieth, to fettle a good Accord between the faid Parties in Difference, concerning the faid first and fecond Bill of Exchange, do thereupon make and put in Writing this my Umpirage and Award between them, as followeth; that is to fay, First, I do hereby award, order, and determine, That the Payment of the faid first " Bill of Exchange fo made by the faid Paris de Monmartel as aforesaid, shall be deem'd and taken as a good Payment made for the own proper Account and Risque of the faid Anthony Da Cofta, and that the faid Anthony Da Cofta shall " bear and fustain all Loss that hath, shall, or may happen on Account of the faid Lewis Guilleman and Company's not having paid the Value of the faid fecond Bili of Exchange as aforefaid: Secondly, I do hereby award and order, That the faid Paris de Monmartel shall, within thirty Days next ensuing the Day of the Date hereof. deliver up, or cause to be deliver'd up, unto or " for the Use of the said Anthony Da Costa, his Executors, Administrators, or Assigns, the Original of the faid first Bill of Exchange so paid by the faid Paris de Monmartel as aforesaid, in order for the faid Anthony Da Cofta, his Executors, Administrators, or Assigns recovering for " his or their own Use, from the Executor or Executors of the faid Lewis Guilleman, deceased, " the Amount of the Value thereof, or fuch Part thereof as he or they can get; and that thereupon the faid Anthony Da Costa and the faid Paris de Monmartel shall execute unto or for the Use of each other, a good and sufficient Release

C

4

"

66

"

"

"

66

"

66

46

"

66

" leafe or Discharge concerning the said first and " fecond Bill of Exchange, and the Monies fo paid on the faid first Bill of Exchange: And, "Thirdly, I do hereby award and order, That " upon the faid Anthony Da Costa's allowing that " the Payment of the faid first Bill of Exchange " fo made by the faid Paris de Monmartel as aforesaid, is a good Payment made for the own proper Account of the faid Anthony Da Costa. and upon the faid Paris de Monmartel's deliver-" ing up, or caufing to be deliver'd up, the Original of the faid first Bill of Exchange, and upon " the said Anthony Da Costa and the said Paris de " Monmartel's executing unto or for the Use of " each other a good and fufficient Release or Dif-" charge concerning the faid first and second Bill " of Exchange, and the Monies fo paid on the " faid first Bill of Exchange, in Manner as afore-" faid, all Disputes and Differences whatsoever " between the faid Parties concerning the faid first " or second Bill of Exchange, shall utterly cease and determine: And, Laftly, I do hereby award " and order, That each of the said Parties shall " bear and pay his own Charges towards this " Award, and other Writings or Things hereto-" fore any ways made relating thereto. In Witness whereof I the said James Gaultier have to two " Parts of these Presents of the same Tenor and " Date fet my Hand and Seal, in London, the "Twenty-third Day of April, in the Ninth Year of the Reign of our Sovereign Lord GEORGE " the Second, by the Grace of God, King of " Great Britain, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, and in the Year of our Lord One " thousand Seven hundred and Thirty-six."

e

d

)-

a

11

y

14

f

1:

at

y

f,

or

iis

i-

id

in

u-

or

e-

d,

rt

e-

or

eafe Jam. Gaultier.

It is proper to repeat here, that this Award is the more extraordinary, as Mr. Da Costa proves, that the Bill was demanded the Monday in the Asternoon, and that Mr. Lostau declared, that from the Death of Mr. Guillemau the Comptinghouse being seal'd up, no Receipts or Payments were made; to which no Proofs to the contrary have appear'd to Mr. Da Costa from any body. And tho' the Bill should have been actually agreed not to be paid, but on the Thursday following, which appears to the contrary, by the Demand above made, no Prejudice accrued to Mr. Monmartel, since about Three o' Clock the House stopt Payment.

Mr. Da Costa in what he did had no further View, than the Benesit of his Correspondent, to whom he advanced the Money, and got One-eighth of a Penny Advantage in each French Crown, as appears by the Prices current both of Mr. Medina and Mr. Shergold, of the 23d of October last.



## Mr. DA COSTA'S Letter to Mr. PARIS DE MONMARTEL.

Londres, 11. Novemb. 1735.

Monf. Paris de Monmartel,

1-

(e

er

to

e-

ch

th

of

Mr.

I'AY l'honeur de la vôtre du 17. Octobre, avec le certificat que vous m'envoyes de vos gens de comerce touchant ma lettre, auquel je trouve si peu de raison en ce qu'il avance, que je suis prêt de mettre nôtre difference en arbitrage icy a Londres sur le point auquel vous mettez tant de force, qui est que quand on fournit une lettre pour compte d'autre, on doit recevoir au même temp l'argent, & en cas qu'on ne le fasse pas, que le risque est pour compte du tireur, & non pour celui du cometant. Et pour cela s'il vous plait vous pouves choifir un negotiant de vôtre part, & j'en choiserai un autre de la mienne, & si les deux ne s'accordent pas, qu'ils ayent pouvoir de choisir un troisieme, & en cas qu'ils trouvent que vous ayes raison, je prendray le risque pour mon compte, mais étant de contraire opinion le risque sera pour vôtre compte. - Et pour ce qui regarde aux inconvenients monstreux trop aisé a concevoir, cela ne s'entend pas avec de persones comme Mr. P. de Monmartel & moy, mais avec des gens qui n'ont ni conscience ni honneur, & tout ce que je puis vous dire c'est, que si j'etois en vôtre cas, je n'aurois pas fait la moindre difficulté avec Mons. P. de Monmartel de prendre le risque sur moy, voyant si clairement que ce que j'ai agi est selon la coûtume ordinaire dirigée en vôtre interest, & en cas qu'on voulusse pretendre d'étre payé pour la traite le jour qu'on donne

donne la lettre, il faudroit tirer avec beaucoup de desavantage dans le change, & étre tenu en compte de redicule de voloir proposer des choses hors la regle generale de comerce. Ainsi vous voyez que de ma part il n'y a eu aucune complaisance, & que la persone a qui j'ay donné la lettre étoit en tres bon credit.

#### Mr. Paris de Monmartel,

I AM favour'd with yours of the 17th of Decemb. by which you fend me a Certificate from your Merchants concerning my Letter, and I find fo little Reason in what it advances, that I am ready to refer our Difference to be decided by Arbitration here in London upon the Point you put fo much Stress on, which is, that when a Person furnishes a Bill for Account of another, he ought at the same time to receive the Money; and in case he does not do it, that then the Risque is for Account of the Drawer, and not of the Principal. And as to that, you may chuse, if you please, a Merchant on your Part, and I will chuse another on mine, and if these two cannot agree, let them have a Power to chuse a third; and in case they shall find that you are in the right, I will take the Risque for my Account; but being of a contrary Opinion, the Rifque shall be for your Account .-And as to what regards the monstrous Inconveniencies easily to be conceived, that must not be understood betwixt Persons like Mr. Paris de Monmartel and myself, but People who have neither Conscience nor Honour. And all that I can fay to you is, that if I was in your Case I should not have made the least Difficulty with Mr. P. de Monmartel to take the Risque upon me, it being evident that what I did is according to the com[ 19]

common Custom directed for your Interest; and in case a Person should pretend to be paid for the Draught the Day he delivers the Bill, he would be obliged to draw with great Disadvantage in the Exchange, and be look'd upon as ridiculous for pretending to propose Things contrary to the general Rule of Commerce. Thus you see that on my Part there has been no Complaisance, and that the Person to whom I gave the Letter was in very good Credit.



hus : Population of the best of the Rutt nomine ode not how to be been been the poly for the Elegan ort and end recent the Court adoptiv 100 white of breller a T protending to propor a constitute of the forest and and professioners the transit of the transit of the transit of in they good Cod E.

